NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

ARTHUR HOOVER,
 	
        Petitioner,
 	
v.
 	
THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY,
 	
        Respondent;
 	
GRUNDFOS PUMPS CORP., et al.,
 	
        Real Parties in Interest.
	A156168
	
	(San Francisco County
	Super. Ct. No. CGC-17-276572)

BY THE COURT[1]:

        In accordance with our prior notification to the parties that we might do so, we will direct issuance of a peremptory writ in the first instance. (*Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc.* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 171, 177–180.) Petitioner's right to relief is obvious, and no useful purpose would be served by issuance of an alternative writ, further briefing, and oral argument. (*Ng v. Superior Court* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 29, 35; see *Lewis v. Superior Court* (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1232, 1236–1237, 1240–1241; *Brown, Winfield & Canzoneri, Inc. v. Superior Court* (2010) 47 Cal.4th 1233, 1240–1244.) In our order requesting briefing, we provided *Palma* notice.

---

1 Before Kline, P.J., Richman, J., and Miller, J.

Let a peremptory writ of mandate issue directing respondent superior court to set aside and vacate its November 29, 2018 order denying Petitioner's motion for an order maintaining the current trial date with preference, and to enter a new and different order granting the motion and maintaining the January 22, 2019 trial date with preference.

In the interests of justice and to prevent further delays, this decision shall be final as to this court immediately. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.490(b)(2)(A).) The remittitur will issue immediately upon the finality of this opinion as to this court, should the parties so stipulate. (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 8.272(c)(1) and 8.490(d).)